

bill, prescription drug prices in the United States are going to drop dramatically.

I have used examples and I have my charts, and people can argue with my charts, although no one does. The pharmaceutical industry can come in and say, well, it is not true that Americans really have to pay \$360 for Tamoxifen while they can buy it for \$60 in Germany. Maybe that is true, maybe it is not true; but that is what we found out in the research we did. We bought the drug in Munich, Germany, for \$59.05. We called pharmacies here in Washington, D.C. and asked them how much does this particular drug in this particular milligrams, this number of tablets, what does it sell for, and they said it is \$360.

Now, maybe we are wrong, but that is an honest mistake. But we believe we are telling the truth, and in everything we have done we have cited our sources. Now, some people have questioned our sources, but they are making up facts that they know are not true. This is not about abortion. It is not about RU-486. The question that we are going to be asked, hopefully next week, is will we stand with American consumers, or will we stand with the giant pharmaceutical industry. I hope we will get the right answer.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the letters I referred to above:

JULY 10, 2003.

Hon. GIL GUTKNECHT,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR GIL. I was shocked to learn that some opponents of free-market access for prescription drugs have begun arguing that your legislation, H.R. 2427, the "Pharmaceutical Market Access Act of 2003" somehow promotes abortion and, more specifically, the availability of abortion drugs such as RU-486.

As you may recall, while in the House I was the author of not only provisions to permit the reimportation of FDA-approved drugs, but also the author of the House-approved proposal to block FDA-approval of RU-486. As a pro-life practicing physician who earned a 100 percent pro-life voting record while serving in Congress, I find it ludicrous that those who oppose your legislation would resort to ad hominem attacks with no basis in reality.

I can state unequivocally that your legislation in no way, shape, or form promotes abortion. Many pro-life members are original cosponsors of your legislation and, quite obviously, do not believe your bill violates their deeply held convictions about the sanctity of life. Those who argue that your legislation makes abortion drugs more accessible by lowering overall drug prices necessitate the conclusion that in order to be pro-life one must be in favor of increasing all drug costs. I suppose the argument would be the higher the drug costs the more fervent your pro-life beliefs.

In Washington, it was always sad to see organizations drift from their core principles and take positions that defined common sense and logic. Any organization that links your legislation with the abortion debate will, in the long-term undermine their credibility and relevancy in Washington. While the pharmaceutical industry has provided many wonderful saving drugs, it would be unwise for anyone to believe that the indus-

try that developed and fought for FDA approval of RU-486 is now motivated by a passion for the pro-life cause.

The fact that opponents of your legislation have resorted to these attacks is shameful, yet the obtuseness of their logic ultimately serves to highlight the soundness of your argument.

Sincerely yours,

TOM A. COBURN, M.D.
Former Member of Congress.

JULY 16, 2003.

DEAR COLLEAGUE. While we do not agree on the reimportation of prescription drugs, we both have devoted our careers to defending the sanctity of human life. We are disheartened by recent ads and targeted mailings that attack Members' pro-life credentials even in cases where Members have 10 percent pro-life voting records.

While we both wish the RU-486 were not legal, this debate is not about abortion. Many pro-life Members are original cosponsors of legislation that would allow the reimportation of prescription drugs, and many pro-life Members staunchly oppose this proposal.

Any effort to tangle this issue with abortion is misleading. We must not confuse the fight to defend the innocent life with a dispute over whether or not to import drugs from foreign countries.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH R. PITTS,
Chairman, House Values Action Team.
CHRIS SMITH,
Co-Chairman, House Pro-Life Caucus.

DEMOCRATIC STUDY GROUP ON NATIONAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, tonight I am proud to join my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT), as well as our other colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL), as Chairs of the Democratic Study Group on National Security.

Mr. Speaker, we founded this group to advance principles and policies of national security which will strengthen America. We have been meeting with nations, top national security experts, and we have been taking to the House floor to respond to world events. We will also be introducing legislative matters to improve our safety here and around the world. I hope to address one of those tonight, that of the intelligence on Iraq's weapons of mass destruction.

But, first, I would like to articulate 10 principles of national security which I believe unite those that have come to associate themselves with the Democratic Study Group on National Security.

First, our soldiers. We support our men and women in uniform, our soldiers, our sailors, our marines, our airmen and -women, our veterans, our reservists, our National Guard, completely and unequivocally. Our soldiers are the foundation of our Nation's security.

Second, military strength. We believe that America's military strength

is superior in every respect, and we are committed to making sure it remains that way. The supremacy of America's military capability is the cornerstone of our security.

Number three, military transformation. We believe that America's military must be transformed to one that is more versatile, more agile, more capable of responding to multiple crises in far-away places and even more technologically powerful.

Number four, troop levels. We believe America's Armed Forces must not be overextended; that our reserves must not be stretched too thin; that the number of our troops must reflect the number of our military commitments we are likely to face and the severity of those commitments. We must either reduce the number of our commitments or increase the number of our troops. As General Shinseki recently said, "Beware the 12-division strategy for a 10-division army."

Number five, intelligence. We believe that in the war on terrorism, top-quality human and technological sources of intelligence are essential and that the reporting of intelligence must be accurate, timely, and properly weighted. The assimilation of that intelligence will be essential if we are to avoid another September 11.

Six, vision. We believe that America cannot make itself secure by virtue of its military power alone; that moral authority, integrity, generosity, and vision are vital to our peace and prosperity. An America that inspires hope in its ideals must complement an America that inspires awe in its strength. We are a more secure America when we rally the world to our side in a great cause.

Seven, democracy. We believe that the best hope for a secure America rests in the propagation of democracy around the world and that every instrument of American influence, diplomatic, military and economic, should advance the cause of democracy abroad. Democracies are poor breeding grounds for terrorism and war.

Eight, civil rights. We believe that America must be confident in its strength, vigilant in the defense of the homeland, supportive of police and firefighters on the front line, and jealously protective of the rights of all Americans. We will not let terrorists change our way of life, we will not live in fear, and we will not undermine the civil rights which characterize our democracy.

Nine, commerce. We believe that the free and fair flow of goods and commerce has the capability of lifting countries out of the despair of poverty and that we must act resolutely to eradicate the economic deprivation which allows the germ of terrorism to spread. Americans are blessed with great plenty. We are a generous people, and we have a moral obligation to assist those who are suffering from poverty, disease, war, and famine.

Finally, number ten, world community. We believe that America lives in

an interdependent world, made smaller by travel, technology, and the demands of a burgeoning population. America has a critical role to play as the most powerful member of the world community. And in this community, as in all others, the golden rule still applies: we must act toward other nations as we would have them act towards America.

Tonight, let me address very quickly, in the remaining time that I have, one of these 10 commandments of national security, and that is sound intelligence.

I believe we ought to have an independent commission investigate the intelligence on Iraq's weapons of mass destruction. I supported the authorization of force, as did many of my colleagues, in a bipartisan manner, on the basis of intelligence that showed that Iraq possessed chemical, biological, and nuclear programs. We must determine whether that intelligence was accurate. We must determine whether that intelligence was weighted properly. We must determine whether that intelligence was presented to this Congress and the American people in an accurate manner.

This is essential, number one, because this Congress made the most important determination it can make, and that is the determination authorizing the use of force on the basis of that intelligence; and, number two, if we are to avoid another September 11, we must ensure we have a sound intelligence process. And, finally, our standing in the world, the willingness of other nations to cooperate with America in the future will be dependent on how we resolve this issue.

INCREASED EFFICIENCY IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, tonight I want to add my voice to those of my fellow Representatives who are calling for increased efficiency in our Federal Government. Our group has taken the charge to protect precious taxpayer dollars by streamlining and improving our Federal Government. There are many important programs that are being hurt. There are expenditures which could have been handled with much greater care. With wise stewardship, we can ensure that public servants have more prudent oversight when allocating American taxpayer dollars for Federal programs.

Mr. Speaker, in my previous life I was a simple country doctor. I want to share with my colleagues some astonishing examples of some of the extreme expenditures in the Medicare program.

Over 90 percent of Medicare payments to community medical health centers in five States, \$229 million, were "unallowable or highly questionable."

Medicare paid roughly \$20 million to dead beneficiaries between 1999 and

2000. Some of these benefits were distributed despite the fact that the Department's database had the dates of death already logged in.

Mr. Speaker, since coming to Congress, I have been appointed a member of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. On that committee, I wanted to make certain that the United States Department of Transportation was ensuring the most efficient business practices within the agency. On March 19, 2003, I met with the Department of Transportation Inspector General, Kenneth Mead, to discuss the business practices of the agency and how the Congress can better facilitate the decrease of inappropriate expenditures in relation to transportation's spending. Inspector General Mead and I discussed the need for greater stewardship and oversight in all of the Department of Transportation's programs.

The Department of Transportation has not changed the way the agency disburses transportation funding to State and local entities since President Eisenhower was in office. We talked some tonight about trying to achieve one penny in savings for every dollar that we spend. The Inspector General of the Department of Transportation pointed out that if 1 percent of the \$500 billion spent over the last 10 years on transportation programs was set-asides, the Department of Transportation would have an extra \$5 billion to spend. That \$5 billion, incidentally, would fund four of the current top 11 transportation building programs going on in the country today. I believe this practice could better assist the Department of Transportation in spending the taxpayers' dollars more wisely.

There are several successful transportation projects that can be used as examples for greater government efficiency. For example, Interstate Highway 15 in the State of Utah was rehabilitated ahead of schedule and under budget. Today, from my district, I met with representatives of the Dallas Area Rapid Transit and those officials reported to me that they are currently within their budget, and DART intends to return some transit funding to the Federal Government.

And, of course, we all know there are examples that are not so good of transportation projects that are overbudget and behind schedule: the Springfield Interchange, not far from here in Virginia; and perhaps the poster child of government inefficiency, the Central Artery Project in Boston, Massachusetts, the Ted Williams Tunnel, we all know down in Texas as the Big Dig.

□ 2145

We need to address the misuse of Federal transportation expenditures as soon as possible.

Members may also be interested to know the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure believes government efficiency is important because next week on July 22 the com-

mittee will hold a hearing on the elimination of waste, fraud, and abuse in mandatory transportation programs as required by the fiscal year 2004 budget resolution instructions. I look forward to participating in the hearing, as well as working with the Inspector General, Mr. Mead, to further address this issue within the U.S. Department of Transportation.

We are dedicated to protecting taxpayers' hard-earned dollars from being spent on inappropriate expenditures. We need to work together to ensure that our Federal Government is more effective and more efficient for the American taxpayer.

STALLED NORTHERN IRELAND PEACE PROCESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GINGREY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow afternoon British Prime Minister Tony Blair is scheduled to address a joint session of Congress in this Chamber. Mr. Blair will likely spend much of his speech discussing both the U.S. and U.K. victory in Iraq and our efforts to bring democracy to the Iraqi people. He can certainly tout the fact that the Iraqi people are now free of oppression and finally afforded the basic human rights that were denied under the regime of Saddam Hussein.

But, Mr. Speaker, I cannot help finding it hypocritical for Prime Minister Blair to discuss freeing the Iraqis given the nature of his policies in Northern Ireland. Prime Minister Blair sent tens of thousands of British troops thousands of miles to bring democracy to a region at the same time he was denying the basic right of democracy to people only miles from the British seat of government.

Mr. Speaker, as you may know, in May Prime Minister Blair announced the indefinite postponement of the elections in Northern Ireland, which were scheduled to be held on May 29. Since his announcement, Prime Minister Blair has made little progress towards reinstating the stalled Irish peace process and providing basic human rights to the people of Northern Ireland.

Five years ago under the guidance of former Senator George Mitchell, all of the major parties, both Catholic and Protestant, signed onto an agreement that was to govern the future of Northern Ireland. The Good Friday Accords were touted near and far by human rights groups and media outlets as an agreement which would finally bring an end to the sectarian violence in Northern Ireland.

Now, just when the agreement seemed to be bearing a fruitful peace, Prime Minister Blair and his Protestant allies have decided it is time to derail the process to ensure that the citizens of Northern Ireland continue